

**REMARKS**

**I. STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1, 4, 6-12, 15-17, 19-40 and 43-58 are pending. Claims 1 and 40 are amended herein. Support for the amendments can be found in claims 12, 13, and 18. Claims 2, 3, 5, 12, 13, 18, 41 and 42 are canceled. Claims 4, 6-11, 21-39 and 48-58 are withdrawn from consideration as allegedly being drawn to a non-elected invention. No new matter is added by the amendments provided herein. Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

**II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

**A. Rejection based on JP Patent Publication 4-307787 to Iketani ("Iketani"), JP Patent Publication 1-249333 to Nagamine et al. ("Nagamine"), and WO 93/24312 to Papageorge et al. ("Papageorge").**

Claims 1, 12-20, 40, and 43-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Iketani in view of Nagamine, and further in view of Papageorge. Decision on Appeal at p. 2. In the Decision on Appeal mailed July 31, 2012 ("Decision"), the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences ("Board") affirmed the Examiner's rejection. Decision at p. 7. Applicants hereby re-open prosecution of this application to present further amendments and arguments with regard to the § 103 rejection over Iketani, Nagamine, and Papageorge, which were not previously considered by the Board.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 40 to include the recitations of claims 12, 13, and 18 to further distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. For example, independent claims 1 and 40, as amended, recite in relevant part, "wherein said at least one non-degreased fabric has an air permeability, measured

according to ASTM D 737, of no greater than 10 standard cubic feet per minute per square foot.” Fabrics that are formed with air permeability values described in the amended claims have better “wet-through” (penetration of a polymeric matrix material through the mat or fabric) and “wet-out” (penetration of a polymeric matrix material through the individual bundles or strands of fibers in the mat or fabric) properties than fabrics found in the prior art, *e.g.*, Iketani, Nagamine, and Papageorge, that do not specify such properties. See Applicants’ specification, page 2 and 84-86. Specifically warp yarns that have air permeability values such as those claimed in the present invention preferably have elongated cross-sections and high strand openness. This facilitates penetration of a matrix material into a fabric or bundle of fibers. *Id.* at p. 86. Warp yarns with higher air permeability values generally have a circular cross-section and low strand openness and thus do not facilitate penetration. *Id.*

The claimed air permeability would not have been inherent or obvious based on the teachings of Iketani, Nagamine, and Papageorge. Good matrix or resin penetration into the warp yarn bundles (*i.e.*, good resin wet out) during lamination can improve the overall hydrolytic stability of laminates and electronic supports made in accordance with the present invention by reducing or eliminating paths of ingress for moisture into the laminates and electronic supports. *Id.* This can also have a positive effect in reducing the tendency of printed circuit boards made from such laminates and electronic supports to exhibit electrical short failures due to the formation of conductive anodic filaments when exposed, under bias, to humid conditions. *Id.*

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner has the burden of establishing that the prior art references teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See

*In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). Because Iketani, Nagamine, and Papageorge do not teach or suggest at least the “air permeability” aspect of Applicants’ claimed invention, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this obviousness rejection be withdrawn.

### III. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments remarks, Applicants submit that the claimed invention is not rendered obvious based on the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner’s reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 1, 2012

By: Jennifer R. Gupta  
Jennifer R. Gupta  
Reg. No. 54,257